



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,130	04/13/2004	Anand G. Dabak	TT-28984A	3498
23494 7590 12/05/2008 TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265				
EXAMINER				
PHAN, MAN U				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2419				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/05/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/823,130

Applicant(s)

DABAK ET AL.

Examiner

Man Phan

Art Unit

2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-38 and 41-45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-38, 41-45 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment and Argument

1. This communication is in response to applicant's 04/30/2008 Amendment in the application of Dabak et al. for a "Space time transmit diversity for TDD/WCDMA systems" filed 04/13/2004. This application is a continuation of 09/514,452 filed 02/25/2000 is now U.S. Patent #6,775,260 which claims benefit of 60/121,541 filed 02/25/1999, and claims benefit of 60/121,657 filed 02/25/1999, and claims benefit of 60/135,263 filed 05/21/1999. The amendment and response has been entered and made of record. Claims 40-45 have been added. Claims 36-38 and 40-45 are pending in the application.
2. Applicant's remarks and argument to the rejected claims are insufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior arts or overcome the rejection of said claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as discussed below. Applicant's argument with respect to the pending claims have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive for at least the following reasons.
3. In response to Applicant's argument that the reference does not teach or reasonably suggest the functionality upon which the Examiner relies for the rejection. The Examiner first emphasizes for the record that the claims employ a broader in scope than the Applicant's disclosure in all aspects. In addition, the Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim limitations, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. Since the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is required to interpret

the claim limitations in terms of their broadest reasonable interpretations while determining patentability of the disclosed invention. See MPEP 2111. In other words, the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000), *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999), and *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004). Any term that is not clearly defined in the specification must be given its plain meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2111.01. See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *Sunrace Roots Enter. Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 1302, 67 USPQ2d 1438, 1441 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *Brookhill-Wilk I, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1294, 1298 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2003). The interpretation of the claims by their broadest reasonable interpretation reduces the possibility that, once the claims are issued, the claims are interpreted more broadly than justified. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). Also, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, the failure to significantly narrow definition or scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims in parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to distinctly define the claimed invention.

On page 9, last paragraph, Applicant's argument that "This feature of the claimed invention is described in detail at paragraph 34-35 and Figures 5B and 6A of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0101032" on which the Applicant relies on. However, It is the claims that define the claimed invention, and it is claims, not specifications that are anticipated or unpatentable. *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices Inc.*, 7 USPQ2d 1064. Furthermore, the U.S.Pub. No. 2004/0101032 is the U.S. Application No. 10/718,338 and not the U.S. Application 10/823,130 that being examined.

Since no substantial amendments have been made and the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, the claims are drawn to the same invention and the text of the prior art rejection can be found in the previous Office Action. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the references cited and applied in the last office actions for the rejection of the claims are maintained in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention..

5. The newly added claims 40, 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention. The newly added limitations of the claims 40, 43 and 44-45 have no support in the disclosure (MPEP § 2161 - § 2165.04. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Waldemar Link, GmbH & Co. v. Osteonics Corp. 32 F.3d 556, 559, 31 USPQ2d 1855, 1857 (Fed. Cir. 1994); In re Rasmussen, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981). See MPEP § 2163.06 - § 2163.07(b) for a discussion of the relationship of new matter to 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. New matter includes not only the addition of wholly unsupported subject matter, but may also include adding specific percentages or compounds after a broader original disclosure, or even the omission of a step from a method. See MPEP § 608.04 to § 608.04(c). See In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976) and MPEP § 2163.05 for guidance in determining whether the addition of specific percentages or compounds after a broader original disclosure constitutes new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 36-38 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whinnett et al. (US#6,317,411) in view of Secord et al. (US#6,373,831).

With respect to claims 36, 38, the references disclose a controlling method and system for transmitter diversity technique in wireless communications, according to the essential features of the claims. Whinnett et al. (US#6,317,411) teaches a circuit, comprising an encoder circuit coupled to receive a plurality of symbols [Fig. 5, 20], the encoder circuit producing the plurality of symbols at a first output terminal [Fig. 5, top line output of 88] and a transform of the plurality of symbols at a second output terminal within a time slot [Fig. 5, bottom line output of 88 which is a transform of original data], the encoder circuit producing a sequence of predetermined signals interposed with the plurality of symbols [Fig. 5, 92 adds predetermined signals]. Whinnett et al. (US#6,317,411) further teaches a circuit wherein the first coded signal is applied to a first antenna [Fig. 5, 100]; and a second multiplier circuit coupled to receive the transform of the plurality of first symbols and arranged to multiply the transform of the plurality of first symbols by the code corresponding to the first user to produce a second coded signal [Fig. 5, 92], wherein the second coded signal is applied to a second antenna [Fig. 5, 102].

In the same field of endeavor, Secord et al. (US#6,373,831) teaches circuit is coupled to receive a control signal, the encoder circuit producing the plurality of symbols at the first output terminal and the transform of the plurality of symbols at the second output terminal in response

to a first value of the control signal, the encoder circuit producing the plurality of symbols at the first output terminal and not producing the transform of the plurality of symbols at the second output terminal in response to a second value of the control signal [Col. 5, lines 43-49, power control bits which transforms the signal are only inserted depending on output signal of MUX 40 in Fig. 5]. Secord et al. (US#6,373,831) further teaches a diversity control circuit coupled to receive a first input signal, the diversity control circuit producing the control signal corresponding to the first input signal [Col. 5, lines 39-43, MUX 40 in Fig. 5 produces the control signal corresponding to the first input signal from 20]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to decide whether to transform or not plurality of symbols at second output terminal to provide additional time diversity [Col. 5, lines 37-39].

Regarding claim 37, It's noted that, the midamble is a designated portion of a time division channel timeslot containing a known code sequence that is used at the receiver during channel estimation. Depending on the communication system, the code sequence can be used in various forms. For example, the code sequence in an IEEE 802.16 wideband wireless access system can be used in a preamble or a pilot signal format, and in a multi-input, multi-output (MIMO) system, the code sequence can be used as a midamble format (located between two data areas).

Regarding claims 41-42, they are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 36-38 above. Therefore, claims 41-42 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 36-38.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Dabak et al. (US#2004/0101032) is cited to show the space time transmit diversity for TDD/WCDMA systems.

The Shou et al. (US#6,212,219) shows the spread spectrum communication system.

The Zhou et al. (US#6,370,130) is cited to show the spread spectrum comm. system.

The Alisobhani et al. (US#6,430,212) shows the spread spectrum GMSK/M-ary radio.

The Gorday et al. (US#6,594,317) is cited to show the simple encoding/decoding technique for code position modulation.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP ' 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3149. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri from 6:00 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at toll free 1-866-217-9197.

Mphan

Dec. 02, 2008

/Man Phan/

Application/Control Number: 10/823,130

Page 10

Art Unit: 2419

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2419